

letter reviewed the commitment and support to Indian issues demonstrated by the Republican Senators, one of whom was a likely presidential candidate for 1996. The letter noted that tribal leaders had in recent years demonstrated a “growing sophistication . . . in national politics,” understanding that they “should not be tied to any political party.”

Meanwhile, Kitto promptly prepared a “legislative update” for the Minnesota tribes, describing the April 28 meeting’s central theme:

On Friday April 18 [sic], a delegation of tribes from Minnesota and Wisconsin met with DON FOWLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE (DNC). The purpose of the meeting was to request the DNC and the Committee to re-elect [sic] the President, to help communicate with the White House and the President about why the Department of the Interior should not approve the fee-to-trust land transfer for the Hudson Dog Track. The message was quite simple: all of the people against this project, both Indian and non-Indian are Democrats who have a substantially large block of votes and who contribute heavily to the Democratic Party. In contrast, all of the people for this project are Republicans. Fowler assured the group that he would take this issue up with high ranking officials in the White House and, if necessary, would arrange a meeting with Tribal officials and the White House, and that he would do this in a very timely manner. They spent almost two hours educating the DNC on the issue and felt the meeting was both timely and productive.

(Emphasis in original.) On May 1, Artman summarized the meeting in a similar fashion for his partner and their Oneida clients:

[T]ribal members at the meeting appealed to Mr. Fowler for help in convincing Secretary Babbitt of the deleterious ramifications [of approving the proposal]. The problem was framed as a situation in which tribes with pronounced Republican leanings are about to receive approval of their proposal, which will hurt tribes which have traditionally supported Democrats. Mr. Fowler stated that he would speak with the President’s assistant, Harold Ickes. He would urge Mr. Ickes to urge Secretary Babbitt to make a closer examination of the proposed operation.

On May 3, Ho-Chunk lobbyist Tom Krajewski reported to his client that Kitto had cast Fowler’s response in these terms: